



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Classical Weekly

Entered as second class matter November 18, 1907, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 28, 1918

VOL. XIV

NEW YORK, MARCH 14, 1921

No. 18

AN ILLUSTRATION OF HORACE, SERMONES 1. 3

In Sermones 1.3, Horace begins with an extreme example of that very censoriousness which it is the business of this Sermo to combat (1-18. See Greenough's notes). He could be sure that his opening verses would attract attention; compare verses 55 ff., and the spirit of Tacitus, Agricola 1.1, especially the last sentence. Having gained the reader's full attention, he passes on then to preach, as he had from the first intended to preach, against censoriousness; if his reader had any conscience at all, his enjoyment of the opening verses would help to emphasize the correctness of the lesson that Horace is seeking to impress upon him. Another example of excessive censoriousness is given in the story about Maenius (21-23). In 21-23 Maenius plays the rôle which Horace himself seemed to be playing in 1-18; it follows, therefore, that the condemnation so unhesitatingly heaped on Maenius, in 24, is a condemnation of such censoriousness as is represented in 1-18. It is convenient for Horace to substitute another, Maenius, for himself, and to make that other, Maenius, take the odium of his condemnation of censoriousness.

At verse 19, Horace sought to make use of the dialogue method, by introducing an imaginary interlocutor. But he does not use the dialogue method very long; from 25 on we have a long monologue. What happens here, in the substitution of monologue for dialogue, is exactly what happens in Sermo 1.1. 54ff.: see my remarks in Transactions of the American Philological Association, xlv, 96. From 25 on, the development of the thought, in the monologue, is as follows:

'Don't keep your gaze fixed so intently on the mote that is in some other man's eye that you cannot see the beam that is in your own (25, to *Epidaurius*, 27); bear in mind that others can see this beam if you cannot (*at tibi . . . illi*, 27-28). Think of the other man's good points, not of his failings (29-*corpore*, 34), bearing in mind always your own shortcomings (*denuque . . . agris*, 34-37). In regard to the failings of others, act as the lover acts, or as the father acts; in a word, underestimate rather than overestimate the failings of others' (49-54).

I want to dwell a little while on verses 28-34:

Iracundior est paulo, minus aptus acutis
naribus horum hominum; rideri possit eo quod
rusticius tonso toga defluit, et male laxus
in pede calceus haeret: at est bonus, ut melior vir
non alius quisquam, at tibi amicus, at ingenium ingens
inculto latet hoc sub corpore.

The words *minus aptus acutis naribus horum hominum* (29-30) describe a man as "scarce fit to face the polished banter of the men of our day" (so Palmer).

The opposite of the phrase, *naribus acutis*, is found in Horace himself, in Epodes 12. 3. This Epode is a lampoon on a woman whose advances had become repulsive. Verses 1-3 run as follows:

Quid tibi vis, mulier nigris dignissima barris?
Munera cur mihi quidve tabellas
mittis, nec firmo iuveni neque naris obesae?

For a commentary on both phrases, *acutis naribus* and *naris obesae*, we need look no further than Horace himself, Epodes 12. 4 Namque sagacius unus odoror, etc.

Two other passages of Horace are in point. One is Sermones 1. 6.1-6 (the passage which contains the famous phrase *naso suspendis adunco*). The other is Epistles 1. 19.45-46. This letter is, as is well known, in part Horace's rejoinder to his critics, in part an expression of his scorn of those who imitated him. In verses 41-49 he declares that his critics ridicule his modesty as affected. He declines to cross swords with them, since the combat could lead only to ill feeling. His avoidance of the contest is set forth in the following words (45-47):

Ad haec ergo naribus uti
formido, et, luctantis acuto ne secer ungui,
"Displicet iste locus" clamo et diludia posco.

With Sermones 1.6.5 *naso suspendis adunco*, we may compare Sermones 2.8.64, *Balatio suspendens omnia naso*.

Less germane to our discussion, though it is cited by Wilkins, on Epistles 1.19.45, is Epistles 1.5.21-23. But no doubt the reader is thinking, by this time, of a better parallel, the well known verses of Martial 1.3.1-6:

Argiletanas mavis habitare tabernas,
cum tibi, parve liber, scrinia nostra vacent.
Nescis, heu, nescis dominae fastidia Romae:
crede mihi, nimium Martia turba sapit.
Maiores nusquam rhonchi: iuvenesque senesque
et pueri nasum rhinocerotis habent.

Various other passages of Martial are in point: 1.41.18 non cuicumque datum est habere nasum; 5.19.17 iam dudum tacito rides, Germanice, naso, utile quod nobis do tibi consilium; 4.86.7 nec rhonchos metues maligniorum. We may note, too, the adjective *nasutus*, which occurs, for instance, in Martial 2.54.5 nil nasutius hac maligniusque; 12.37 nasutus nimium cupis videri: nasutum volo, nolo polyposum; 12.88 Tongilianus habet nasum: scio, non nego. Sed iam nil praeter hoc Tongilianus habet; 13.2.1-10.

I do not choose, however, nor do I consider it necessary, to illustrate our Horatian passage further from Latin authors. I merely remind the reader of the familiar cognomina *Nasica* and *Naso*.

Of what precedes I was reminded, by finding recently, among my clippings, one from the New York Sun, of Saturday, April 9, 1898. The clipping, which covers half a column, consists of an extract, apparently, from *The Lancet* (London), which runs as follows:

The nose has at all periods of their history possessed a peculiar significance for Italians. As a symbol of intelligence it figures in familiar speech, ancient and modern, a *homo nasutissimus* being Seneca's equivalent for a very clever man, and *Naso* a name held in honor by the Otacilian, Octavian, Ovidian, and Voconian gentes, while *Nasica* was a cognomen of the Scipios. . . . In the Italy of to-day *aver naso* and *esser di buon naso*. . . . are the first of a series of phrases all turning on that feature in its symbolic sense and giving rise to proverbs infinite in the variety of their applications. The great Napoleon was true to his Italian origin in his preference for a "big nose", and the late Lord Beaconsfield, descended from Venetian Jews, never concealed his scorn for the "flat-nosed Frank". He held, in fact, that to be *simus* was the first step toward being a *simia*. . . . Such a horror have Italians of any lesion costing the face its nose or robbing the latter of its due proportions that rhinoplasty among them has long been one of the "surgical fine arts", and the great Bolognese anatomist Tagliacozzi (1546-99) has for all time given his name to an ingenious method of replacing the feature when lost. Quite in keeping, therefore, with all precedent as well as with the fitness of things, it is in Italy that we have "the cult of the nose", as vital as ever, inasmuch that within the last seven years she has had two *Concorsi di Nasi* (or nose competitions), in which the owners of the feature received prizes according as they could present it in greatest perfection as regards type, size, beauty, and olfactory power. The former of these *Concorsi* was held in 1891 at Padua on the initiative of the students of that medical school, and the citizens were invited, by universal suffrage and secret voting, to name the possessors of *i nasi piu sviluppati e rispettabili* (noses the most pronounced and respectable) of the ancient Venetian town. The prizes, consisting of pocket handkerchiefs and snuff boxes, were in due course awarded by plurality of votes.

At Milan, and quite recently, a much better ordered and more conclusive competition of the same kind has just come off, the whole proceedings being controlled by a committee and the "examinations" conducted in a *Nasoteca* furnished with drawings and water colors of heads well provided with noses, such as would have gladdened the artistic sense of William Hogarth. The competitors numbered thirty-six, but not more than twenty-three appeared before the examiners. The first prize (gold medal) was won by a Venetian . . . a vender of lucifers, whose nose was found to be of "formidable proportions, long, well-pronounced, aggressive, trenchant like a knife blade". The second prize fell to . . . , possessed of a nose "domineering, assuming, with nostrils wide and cavernous". . . . the third prize was adjudged to . . . for the refined, symmetrical proportions of his nasal feature. The last two prizes. . . were given for a nose "without pretension, ingenuous, but solid and well planted", and for one "considerable, regular, and worthy of respect".

C. K.

SOME SPHERES OF ROMAN ORIGINALITY

I

The Romans were unfortunate in coming after the Greeks and so finding certain fields already occupied. If we look only at certain points, we should be inclined to believe that they were only shadows of the Greeks. This, we should say, is a translation, or at best an adaptation, of a Greek work; here is a form borrowed outright, or only slightly modified; for the origin of this construction, see this or that Greek writer. While these are outstanding features in the field of literary expression, there are certain spheres in which the Romans worked unaffected by anything that the Greeks had done. Because of this it is necessary to consider different spheres of non-influence, as well as of influence. The former made up a larger part of Roman life than did the latter, for in (1) agriculture, (2) law, and (3) war the Romans solved their own problems in their own way. In some far-off age, Grecian and Roman systems might have had a common source, but of this the Romans knew nothing, and in each of these three spheres there were centuries of development within the Italian environment before the Romans came in contact with the Greeks.

(1) At the beginning of his work on Agriculture, Varro invokes the aid of twelve gods and goddesses, not those whose statues stand gilded in the Forum, but those that are especially leaders of the farmers—Sky father (Jupiter), and Mother Earth, the Sun and the Moon, whose seasons are observed when certain things are sown or garnered; Ceres and Liber, whose fruits are necessary for living; Rust (Robigus) and Flora; Minerva and Venus, to one of whom belongs the superintendence of olive-orchards, to the other that of vineyards; and also Water (Lympha) and Good Luck (Bonus Eventus), for without water agriculture is arid and pitiable, and without Good Luck it is not husbandry, but disappointment. These gods were not like those of Germany, who, Tacitus says (Germania 9), could be seen *sola reverentia*; they were workers for men, and the outgrowth of the thought of Italians working in an Italian environment.

After the invocation, Varro mentions about fifty Greek writers, but lays special emphasis on the work of Mago the Carthaginian. The value of their works is stated by Stolo, and his words are an interesting revelation of the real attitude of the speakers (1.5.2):

Isti . . . libri non tam idonei iis qui agrum colere volunt quam qui scholas philosophorum; neque eo dico, quo <non> habeant et utilia et communia quaedam.

This statement does not differ much from that of Cicero, *De Oratore* 1.249:

Num igitur, si qui fundus inspiciendus aut si mandandum aliquid procuratori de agri cultura aut imperandum vilico est, Magonis Karthaginensis sunt libri perdiscendi, an hac communi intelligentia contenti esse possumus?